

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 through 10, 12, 13, 15, and 16 are pending in this application. Further reconsideration is requested based on the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 through 10, 12, 13, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Alperovich et al., US 6,078,804, in view of Aoshima, U.S. 6,308,087. The rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 recites:

“wherein said user information generation block (24) is connected to said language setting block (36) to add to said user information (40) said information related to the language that the user can understand.”

Alperovich neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests adding to user information the information related to a language that the user understands, as acknowledged graciously in the Office action. The Office action seeks to modify Alperovich by combining it with Aoshima, saying that it would have been obvious to “make the device adapt to include adding to user information the information related to a language that the user understands because this would allow efficient routing of emergency calls based on user specified data.”

Aoshima, however, neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests adding information related to a language that the user understands to *user* information either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Alperovich with respect to claim 1. Aoshima, rather, is directed to a pager, as described at column 1, lines 7 and 8. Communication in a pager is one-way, and that one way is receiving, as described at column 1, lines 11, 21, 23, 39, and 40, and column 2, lines 28, 34, 44, and 49.

This is to be contrasted with claim 1, in which user information is transmitted on the network system for mobile communications. There is no information being sent, i.e. transmitted on the network system for mobile communications in Aoshima to which information related to a language that the user understands *could* be added.

The passage cited in the Office action, in particular, at column 5, lines 59-61, describes native language code memory 26, which is *resident* on radio selective call receiver 10, as holding a code of a native language set by user. The native language code therefore *stays* on

radio selective call receiver 10 in native language code memory 26 after it is set by a user. This is to be contrasted with claim 1, in which information related to the language that the user can understand is added to *user* information, i.e. information that is being transmitted on the network system for mobile communications.

Similarly, the passage cited at column 7, lines 36 and 37 begins a description of radio selective call receiver 10 translating an incoming message into a native language of a user itself, as may be seen further down, at lines 46 through 54, rather than *adding* information related to a language that the user understands to *user* information as recited in claim 1. In particular, automatic translating unit 16 translates an incoming message that is not in a native language of a user into the native language of the user, as described at column 7, lines 47, 48, 52, 53, and 54.

Since there is no user information being *transmitted* on the network system for mobile communications in Aoshima, there is no information being sent, user or otherwise, to which information related to a language that the user understands *could* be added. Since there is no user information being sent in Aoshima, i.e. all communication is one-way, all of the translating has to occur on radio selective call receiver 10.

Aoshima doesn't even bother *discussing* the transmitter, except implicitly, because radio selective call receiver 10 of Aoshima has no *control* over the information being transmitted over the network by the transmitter. Radio selective call receiver 10 of Aoshima, rather, is a pager, and only receives messages. Whatever language the transmitter chooses to use for transmission of those messages is completely beyond Aoshima's control. No attempt is made to tell the transmitter anything at all about the user, because Aoshima has no control over the transmitter anyway. This is to be contrasted with claim 1, in which information related to a language that the user understands is added to *user* information, i.e. information that is being *transmitted* on the network system for mobile communications.

Since neither Alperovich nor Aoshima teach, disclose, or suggest adding to user information the information related to a language that the user understands, their combination cannot, either. Thus, even if Alperovich were modified as proposed in the Office action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 1 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Application Serial No. 09/936,848
Amendment dated June 1, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2005

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 is also earnestly solicited.

Claim 9 recites, in pertinent part:


"adding to said user information said information related to the language that the user can understand."

Neither Alperovich nor Aoshima teach, disclose, or suggest adding to user information the information related to a language that the user understands, as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Since neither Alperovich nor Aoshima teach, disclose, or suggest adding to user information the information related to a language that the user understands, their combination cannot, either. Thus, even if Alperovich were modified as proposed in the Office action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 9 is thus also submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 10, 12, 13, 15, and 16 depend from claim 9 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 10, 12, 13, 15, and 16 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10, 12, 13, 15, and 16 is also earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 through 10, 12, 13, 15, and 16 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 through 10, 12, 13, 15, and 16 and of this entire application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
By 
Thomas E. McKiernan
Reg. No. 37,889
Attorney for Applicants
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK
Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202)783-6040